

US Serial No. 10/780,490
Page 10

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Applicants are submitting herewith replacement formal drawings sheet 2, including the following correction:

At Figure 5, the exploded parts are now embraced by a bracket.

US Serial No. 10/780,490
Page 11

REMARKS

The above-identified Office Action has been reviewed, the reference carefully considered, and the Examiner's comments carefully weighed. In this regard, corrected formal drawing sheet 2 is being submitted herewith, and Claims 1, 3, 6, 15 and 17 have been amended. It is contended that by the present Amendment, all bases of rejection set forth in the Office Action have been traversed and overcome. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Drawings

Grounds for Objection:

According to the Office Action, the Drawings are objected to in that Figure 5 of sheet 2 should have a bracket embracement.

Applicants' Response:

Applicants are providing with this Amendment replacement sheet 2 including the following correction: In Figure 5, an embracement bracket has been added.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the drawings.

Objection to the Specification

According to the Office Action, the Specification is objected to in that the Brief Description of the Drawings lacks a description of Figures 10A-10E.

Applicants have added, after paragraph [0025] in the Brief Description of the Drawings, five new paragraphs describing, respectively, each of Figures 10A-10E. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the Specification.

Objection to the Claims

According to the Office Action, Claims 3-7 are objected to in that Claim 3 at lines 1-2 recites "each said license plate attachment holes", but should recite "each of said license plate attachment holes".

US Serial No. 10/780,490
Page 12

Applicants have made the correction to Claim 3 requested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the Claims.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112

Ground for Rejection:

According to the Office Action, Claims 1-20 are rejected as being indefinite in that Claims 1, 15 and 17 lack an antecedent basis for "said right main body nut component", and Claim 6 has no antecedent basis for "said first and left openings".

Applicants' Response:

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for noting these antecedent basis problems. To correct these problems, Claims 1, 15 and 17 have been amended to recite "a right main nut body component", thereby providing antecedence for "said right main body nut component". Additionally, Claim 6 has been amended to recite "said right and left openings" which has proper antecedence. Accordingly, in view of these amendments Applicants respectfully request the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102

Grounds for Rejection:

According to the Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 15 and 16 are rejected as being anticipated by Hashim et al.

In view of the present amendment, Applicants respectfully traverse the aforesaid ground for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) for the reasons set forth in detail below.

The test to be applied for purposes of determining the propriety of a rejection of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. 102 is set forth in RCA Corporation v. Digital Data Systems, Inc., 221 U.S.P.Q. 385, 388 (C.A.F.C. 1984), where the Court held:

"Anticipation is established only when a single prior art reference discloses, expressly or under principles of inherency, each and every claimed element of the claimed invention."

US Serial No. 10/780,490

Page 13

Applicants' amended base Claim 1 requires, inter alia:

“... an attachment panel having a left opening and a right opening, said right opening being spaced a predetermined distance from said left opening;

a left main nut body component attached to said attachment panel at said left opening at a first fixed orientation with respect to said attachment panel, said left main nut body component having a first plurality of license plate attachment holes formed therein; and

a right main nut body component attached to said attachment panel at said right opening at a second fixed orientation with respect to said attachment panel, said right main nut body component having a second plurality of license plate attachment holes formed therein;

wherein said first fixed orientation of said left main nut body component is independent of said second fixed orientation of said right main nut body component.”

Applicants' amended base Claim 15 requires, inter alia:

“... an attachment panel;

a left main nut body component attached to said attachment panel at a first fixed orientation with respect to said attachment panel, said left main nut body component having a first plurality of license plate attachment holes formed therein; and

a right main nut body component attached to said attachment panel at a second fixed orientation with respect to said attachment panel, said right main nut body component having a second plurality of license plate attachment holes formed therein;

wherein said first fixed orientation of said left main nut body component is independent of said second fixed orientation of said right main nut body component.”

Applicants' Response:

Hashim et al. require that the left and right attachment brackets be rotatably mounted to the attachment panel and be mutually interconnected by a cross-bar such that a positional change of one of the left and right attachment brackets relative to the attachment panel forces a positional change of the other of the left and right attachment brackets relative to the attachment panel.

In contradistinction, amended base Claims 1 and 15 now require that: 1) the left main body nut body component have a first fixed orientation relative to the attachment panel, 2) the right main body nut body component have a second fixed orientation relative to the attachment panel, and 3) the first fixed orientation of the left main nut body component is independent of the second fixed orientation of the right main nut body component. In view that these claim limitations are not disclosed in Hashim et al, Hashim et al cannot anticipate amended base Claims 1 and 15.

US Serial No. 10/780,490
Page 14

In view of the present amendment and the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 as regards amended base Claims 1 and 15, and, under the principle that dependent claims merely further define their respective base claims, that the rejection be withdrawn as regards Claims 2 and 16.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that Applicants have responded in a fully satisfactory manner to all matters at issue in this application, and that this application is now in condition for allowance. In this regard, Applicants have made every effort to comply with the requirements set forth in the Office Action as well as the statutory requirements. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter this Amendment, allow the claims, and pass this application on to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Laura C. Hargitt - Attorney
Reg. No. 43,989
Telephone: 313-665-4710

LCH:plul